Action

. <u>X</u> Discussion

Χ Information

SUBJECT:

REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT - UPDATE ON KING

COUNTY TRANSFER STATION REVIEW

STAFF CONTACT:

Joyce Nichols, Intergovernmental Relations Director, CMO, 452-4225

Nav Otal, Utilities Director, 452-2041

Alison Bennett, Utilities Policy Advisor, 452-2808

Susan Fife-Ferris, Utilities Communications and Environmental

Outreach Manager, 452-5216

POLICY ISSUE:

The King County Council has directed that the King County Solid Waste Division undertake a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan to ensure that the planned transfer station facilities still meet system needs, including the current plan for a new Factoria Transfer Station. Some of the proposed transfer station options under review would significantly change the future of Factoria

and other potential new stations.

NEEDED FROM COUNCIL

No formal action is required at this time. Staff is seeking preliminary feedback from Council regarding proposed transfer station system options to share with King County at the next system review workshop, scheduled for September 27, 2013. The County is required to develop a draft report for stakeholder review by October 9, 2013. A stakeholder comment period is expected between October 9 and October 23. A

final report is due to the County Council by November 27, 2013.

BACKGROUND:

Bellevue's Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with King County sets forth the responsibilities of the City and King County in providing solid waste disposal services, establishes the County as the solid waste comprehensive planning authority, recognizes that the County sets disposal fees for the system, and requires that the County provide and manage facilities for the transfer and disposal of solid waste. Bellevue's ILA with the County is in effect until June 30, 2028.

In 2005-2006, the region participated in a multi-stakeholder planning process for the solid waste transfer and disposal system. Bellevue was an active member of the discussions at that time. The process resulted in the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, which identified a package of future transfer facilities, including a rebuilt Factoria Transfer Station, a new Northeast station (not yet sited), and a new South County station (not yet sited). The County's Solid Waste Division (SWD) has been working closely with Bellevue staff on the permitting of the new Factoria transfer station over the last year, and those involved report that the collaboration and permitting is complete.

SWD is using a negotiated procurement process to contract for the construction of Factoria. SWD has short-listed several firms from a Request for Qualifications process and will be requesting specific proposals from those firms. The County Council must authorize each step of the negotiated process. Current expenditures on the rebuilding of Factoria are approximately \$21 million, including the purchase of the additional property next to the existing station for the new station. The total budget for the Factoria project is currently \$82 million.

County Council Proviso Regarding Transfer Station System Review

At the same time as Factoria has been moving forward, several events have occurred that prompted the County Council to adopt a proviso in Ordinance 17619 (**Attachment A**) that restricts expenditures on the rebuilding of Factoria until a review and report of the transfer station plan has been completed. Those events include:

- Reduction in torinage due to the economic downturn,
- 2011 King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects, which required a systematic analysis of incremental cost impacts of the number, capacities, and functionality of the transfer stations, and
- Revised tonnage projections based on those cities that have signed a new Interlocal Agreement through 2040. (Cities that did not sign a new Interlocal are Bellevue, Clyde Hill, Yarrow Point, Medina and Hunts Point.)

Pursuant to the proviso, SWD has begun a review process to determine (1) if any changes are needed to ensure that the transfer system is sized and configured appropriately to meet current and future anticipated needs, and (2) whether changes could be made to reduce future expenditures while still meeting desired service objectives and levels. The process has consisted of two workshops to date, with one more scheduled at the end of September, to invite stakeholder feedback. SWD will then produce a draft report on October 9. **Attachment B** is SWD's summary document describing the review process.

In the first workshop, SWD reviewed background and data, including a tonnage forecast, information about compaction at transfer stations, recycling, retention and repair costs of existing stations, self-haul, and drive time analyses. In the second workshop, SWD reviewed storage capacity, alternative disposal technologies, and a series of "what if" scenarios. **Attachment C** summarizes the packages of transfer station alternatives that were presented at the meeting. Attachment C also summarizes how each package fared on an initial Level of Service criteria review.

The <u>Base Plan</u> that exists today (finalized in the 2006 Plan) consists of the following open transfer stations: Shoreline (new station opened in 2009), Bow Lake (new station with grand opening on October 8, 2013), Factoria (to be rebuilt per current plan), and two new future stations - Northeast and South (sites unknown). Under this Base Plan scenario, current stations at Algona, Houghton and Renton will be closed. Out of the eight additional alternative packages presented at the meeting, three would expand Factoria to the upper property on Eastgate Way that is owned by King County, which is inconsistent with prior Council direction. (See map in **Attachment D**). Additional information on the history of the upper Eastgate property is included

below. Two other alternatives would close Factoria completely. The rest include a rebuilt Factoria as envisioned under the current plan.

Self-haul services were also discussed at both workshops. Several options leave certain older transfer stations open for self-haul only, while others limit self-haul at certain new stations. The idea under those scenarios would be to limit self-haul to certain days and/or times. It is important to note that self-haul includes all those who haul directly to the transfer station, including small businesses, school districts, and even large businesses such as Boeing.

The scheduled workshop at the end of September will provide information about cost and rate implications for each alternative, project delivery and financing, impacts to service delivery and local contract collection costs, regional equity and system flexibility to meet future needs.

Background on Upper Eastgate Property

During the 2005-2006 planning process, several of the original transfer station system alternatives that were being considered included an option to build Factoria on the upper Eastgate property. At that time, Council expressed concerns about the significant issues associated with locating a transfer station on that site. That portion of the I-90 corridor was developing as a commercial center, served as a gateway to Bellevue and was incompatible with a transfer station. Traffic impacts and compatibility with surrounding land uses were discussed extensively with King County. Finally, with significant growth in northeast King County, it was recognized that regional equity concerns meant that Bellevue should not have to take all the traffic and bear a disproportionate burden for east King County if a larger Factoria was built rather than a new Northeast station.

In 2006, the City and the County were able to come to a mutually agreeable solution whereby SWD purchased additional property next door to the existing transfer station to enable the station to be completely rebuilt without using the upper Eastgate property. The County also discussed eventually selling the Eastgate property and using the proceeds to help fund system improvements. As mentioned above, the permitting for the new facility has been completed, and a total of \$21 million has been spent to date to advance the current Factoria rebuild.

Since 2006, the City has also adopted the Eastgate I-90 Corridor Plan that solidifies the City's vision for that area of the City. The Plan specifically discusses the County's upper Eastgate property as being redeveloped into offices, with 10-12 story buildings and visual access from I-90. The area is just west of the planned transit-oriented-development near Bellevue College and will significantly increase the economic activity in the area. The Plan also envisions increased street landscaping and on-site open space to enhance the corridor's visual appeal. Siting a transfer station on that site is completely incompatible with the City's vision. Staff communicated this at all of the workshops and Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee meetings to date.

During the last workshop, SWD staff did raise the issues that were discussed and resolved back in 2006, and early indications are that they do not favor the upper Eastgate options. However, Bellevue staff have not seen any additional analyses, and those options are still on the list. It is also important to note that expanding Factoria to the upper Eastgate site may be appealing to other cities who do not wish to have a new Northeast station built in their city.

Next Steps

No formal action is required at this time; staff will be attending the workshop on September 27 and can communicate any initial feedback that Council may provide tonight at that time. Staff will be receiving information on costs and other impacts at the final workshop and can provide additional information to Council after the workshop. Staff will also provide Council an opportunity to provide comments on the draft plan during the comment period, expected to be from October 9 through October 23.

ALTERNATIVES:

N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

- (A) King County Proviso
- (B) King County Summary of Solid Waste Transfer Station Plan Review
- (C) Transfer Station Package Alternatives
- (D) Map of Factoria Transfer Station and upper Eastgate Property

2

07-08-13

	Sponsor:
. •	PH Proposed No.: 2013-0258
1	AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2013-0258, VERSION 2
2	On page 44, line 985, delete everything through page 46 line 1020 and insert
3	"P1 PROVIDED THAT:
4	A. Of the appropriation for CIP project 1048385, Factoria Recycling and Transfer
5	Station, no more than \$750,000 shall be expended or encumbered after the effective date of this
6	legislation and before the division completes a review and report on the 2006 Solid Waste
7	Transfer and Waste Management Plan, and the council accepts the review and report by adoption
8	of the motion by the council. The review and report shall address, at a minimum:
9	1. Tonnage projections, to be based on waste volumes from cities that have indicated
10	commitment to the regional solid waste system through 2040, through approval of the Amended
11	and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement;
12	2. Revenue projections, to be based on waste volumes from cities that have indicated
13	commitment to the regional solid waste system through 2040, through approval of the Amended
14	and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement;
15	3. Overall costs of the region-wide transfer station upgrade;
16	4. Functionality and service alternatives at the respective transfer stations;
17	5. Level of service criteria addressed in the 2006 plan, with particular attention to
18	options for revision to the travel time criterion in the plan, which requires that ninety percent of a
19	station's users be within thirty minutes' travel time;

20	6. Retention and repair of the existing transfer station including itemized cost estimates
21	for retention and repair and updated long-term tonnage projections; and
22	7. The recommendation 4 of the King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste
23	Transfer Station Capital Projects, which requires systematic analysis of incremental cost impacts
24	of the number, capacities and functionality of the transfer stations and assessment of project
25	financing and delivery methods.
26	B. The division shall undertake and complete this review and report, with the
27	participation of stakeholder groups, including, but not limited to, the metropolitan solid waste
28	management advisory committee, the sound cities association, the City of Bellevue and the solid
29	waste advisory committee. The division, as part of the report, shall document all efforts to
30	engage stakeholder groups, document all feedback received from stakeholder groups and
31	document any steps taken to incorporate this feedback into the final report. By October 9, 2013,
32	the Executive shall share a draft of the report with interested stakeholders and councilmembers.
33	By November 27, 2013, the executive shall file the report required by this proviso, together with
34	a motion providing for acceptance of the report, in the form of a paper original and electronic
35	copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to
36	all councilmembers, the council chief of staff and the lead staffs of the budget and fiscal
37	management committee and the transportation, economy and environment committee or their
38	successors."

EFFECT: This amendment would add a provision that the Executive share a draft of the report with the stakeholder groups before sending to the Council and move the date for sending the report to the Council back to November 27th.



Solid Waste Transfer Station Plan Review July 2013

Given recent trends, the economic downturn and potential changes in users of the system in the future, it is timely to conduct a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan. A meaningful review of the planned facilities will help to ensure that approaching planned actions still meet the needs and interest of the system beneficiaries. This document seeks to outline at a high level a recommended approach for carrying out the review in a collaborative, transparent, and effective manner.

Purpose of Review

- 1. Determine if changes are needed to ensure that the transfer system is sized/configured appropriately to meet current and future anticipated needs and;
- Determine whether changes could be made that could reduce future expenditures while still meeting desired service objectives and levels.

Guiding Principles

- The system shall maximize ratepayer value and ensure that participants in King County's solid waste system have access to efficient and reliable regional solid waste handling and disposal services at rates as low as reasonably possible, consistent with sound financial and environmental stewardship.
- Future system facilities will be designed to provide flexibility to accommodate changes in growth, anticipated future customer needs, and future waste disposal options and technologies.
- The system complies with all applicable state and federal law, including requirements for storage for disasters.
- This review will comply with the requirements of <u>ORDINANCE 17619</u> as adopted on July 8, 2013.
- This review will be conducted in a transparent and collaborative manner between King County and its stakeholders, so that all parties have timely access to relevant data and determining factors for decision making.

Assumptions

- 1. Given the significant prior work undertaken to develop the Transfer System Plan, the scope of this plan review will be limited to key issues that have the most potential to impact costs of the remaining planned facilities. The evaluation will identify impacts associated with change scenarios as compared with existing criteria.
- The recommendations received from stakeholders will inform recommendations that SWD makes regarding potential changes to the plan.

Process Overview

- The purpose of the process is to review transfer station options and resulting impacts to cost, service and the environment. The result will be to inform any necessary changes to the current plans for the Factoria, South County, and Northeast county projects.
- 2. SWD workshop meetings will be held on the fourth Friday in July, August, and September and open to all interested parties including MSWMAC, SWAC, city staff, business partners and interested citizens.

Final: 7/22/13 Page 1

3. SWD will utilize MSWMAC and SWAC as the primary bodies to provide information, seek input and obtain feedback and recommendations. In addition to the workshop meetings, SWD will provide updates to the advisory committees during their normally scheduled meetings, and provide briefings to others such as the Regional Policy Committee and Sound Cities Association PIC.

July	August-September	October-November
 MSWMAC and SWAC review proposed process Additional briefings to PIC and RPC 	 MSWMAC and SWAC review data, discuss options, and evaluate impacts. Pre PIC workshop in August 	 Executive presents draft report to stakeholders by October 9 Executive presents final report to Council by November 27
July 26 Transfer Plan Review Workshop	RPC September SWD finalizes analysis and develops recommendation	

Questions that will be answered as a result of the process;

- Given the current tonnage projections through 2040 and requirements of capacity for storage for disasters, what are our options for reconfiguring our Transfer Station system with the remaining decisions to be made? (i.e.: If we build Factoria, will we need a Northeast facility as well or could the volume be absorbed by the other stations? What about South County?)
- 2. What are the major cost drivers in the construction of these new facilities and what options are there to reduce those expenses?
- 3. What current policy decisions could be modified to reduce our capital or operating expense at a new facility? (i.e.; self haul, recycling, emergency storage, etc.)
- 4. What are the customer impacts associated with any given change in terms of cost and service? (i.e.: tipping fees, collection costs, and wait time)

Data to be considered in the review includes;

- 1. The identified issues and recommendations noted in the 2011 "King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects" will be reconciled to the current/planned status.
- 2. The items to consider noted in the 2007 "Independent, Third Party Review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export Plan" will be reconciled to the current/planned status.
- 3. Tonnage projections through 2040 will consider the potential changes in use based on cities committing to remain in the system.
- 4. For any given system configuration and transfer station features reviewed during this effort, calculations will be estimated for:
 - a. System cost per ton
 - b. Operating cost by transfer station
 - c. Transfer station capacity utilization in 2040 for tonnage and transactions
- 5. "What If" scenarios will be run for go/no-go and capacity decisions of the South County, Factoria, and Northeast County facilities. Financial, environmental, and service impacts will be estimated based on the various scenarios.

Final: 7/22/13 Page 2

Alternatives Summary

***************************************	base (Transfer Plan)		Α.	æ	U	ŧ	۵	***	i .
Open facilities	Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria Northeast South County	Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria (expands to include Eastgate property) South County	Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria – Iimited self-haul Houghton – self-haul only	Shoreline Bow Lake Northeast (expanded) South County	Shoreline Bow Lake – Ilmited self-haul Northeast (expanded)	Shoreline Bow Lake – limited self-haul Northeast (expanded) Algona – self-haul only	Shoreline Bow Lake – limited self-haul Factoria (expands to include Eastgate property)	Shoreline Bow Lake – Imited self-haul Factoria (expands to include Eastgate property) Algona self-haul only	
Closed facilities	Algona Houghton Renton	Algona Houghton Renton	Algona Renton	Algona Factoria Houghton Renton	Algona Factoria Houghton Renton	Factoria Houghton Renton	Algona Houghton Renton	Houghton Renton	
Do not build		Northeast	Northeast	Factoria	Factoria South County	Factoria South County	Northeast South County	Northeast South County	1
Pre-load compaction	IIV	All	All except Houghton	ΑĪ	ΑI	All except Algona	Ŧ	All except Algona	
Storage capacity	3 days everywhere	3 days everywhere	3 days everywhere except Houghton	3 days everywhere	3 days everywhere	3 days everywhere except Algona	3 days everywhere	3 days everywhere except Algona	
Self-haul service	Self-haul service All stations, all hours	All stations, all hours	All hours: Shoreline Bow Lake Houghton South County Factoria weekends only	All stations, all hours	All hours: Shoreline Northeast Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours	All hours: Shoreline Northeast Algona Bow Lake weekends and Imited weekday hours	All hours: Shoreline Factoria Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours	All hours: Shoreline Factoria Algona Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours	
Recycling service	Recycling scenario 3 at all stations	Recycling scenario 3 at all stations	Recycling scenario 3: Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria South County Factoria weekends only Houghton limited materials	Recycling scenario 3 at all stations	Recycling scenario 3 at all stations all stations Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours	Recycling scenario 3: Shoreline Bow Lake Northeast Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours Algona yard waste only	Recycling scenario 3 at all stations Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours	Recycling scenario 3. Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria Bow Lake weekends and limited weekday hours Algona yard waste only	* * *
HHW service	Factoria 6 days/week	Factoria 6 days/week	Factoria 6 days/week	Northeast 6 days/week	Northeast 6 days/week	Northeast 6 days/week	Factoria 6 days/week	Factoria 6 days/week	
Map reference	н	2	3,4,5	9	7,8	9, 10, 11	12,13	14, 15, 16	



Peparument of Natural Resources and Parks

Kracumay

Solid Waste Division

The contents of this document explore alternatives without regard to policy. Additional environmental and financial reviews may be necessary to fully understand the implications of any given alternative. Palk to a higher outhority level for application at an appropriate time. Statistics, charts, and numbers are for research and comparison purposes only and should not be applied out of content.

Transfer Plan Level-of-Service Criteria Applied to Alternatives¹

1.	Estimated time to a transfer facility within service area for 90% of users	in the < 30 min = YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO ²	YES	NO ³	YES	YES
2.	Time on site meets standard for 90% of tr	rips⁴									
	a. commercial vehicles	< 16 min = YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	b. business self-haulers	< 30 min = YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	c. residential self-haulers	< 30 min = YES	YES	YES	NO	YE\$	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
3.	. Facility hours meet user demand ⁵	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
4.	Recycling services meet Plan policies										
	a. business self-haulers	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	b. residential self-haulers	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
5.	. Vehicle capacity ⁶										
	a. meets 2027 forecast needs	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NC
	b. meets 2040 forecast needs	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NC
6.	Average daily handling capacity (tons)										
	a. meets 2027 forecast needs	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	b. meets 2040 forecast needs	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7.	Space for 3 days' storage										
	a. at time of construction	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
*****	b. meets 2040 forecast needs	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
8.	Space to expand on-site ⁷	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
9.	Minimum roof clearance of 25 ft.	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
10.	0. Meets facility safety goals	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11.	1. Ability to compact waste	YES/NO	YE\$	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
12.	2. Safety		************	*****	V-A-1-1-2-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1		····		. 6. 61. 61		
	a. Meets goals for structural integrity	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	b. Meets FEMA immediate occupancy standards	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
13.	3. Meets applicable local noise ordinance le	<i>vels</i> YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14.	4. Meets PSCAA standards for odors	YES/NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15.	5. Meets goals for traffic on local streets ⁸							***************************************	***************************************	6.06.00.60.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00	***********
	a. Meets LOS standard	YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
	b. Traffic does not extend onto local stre 95% of the time	eets YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
16.	5. 100 foot buffer between active area and i residence	nearest YES/NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
17.	7. Transfer station is compatible with surroul fand use	inding YES/NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
	rurru WJE	······································					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				******

¹ Criteria applied to the overall system alternative – individual transfer stations may vary

See drive time map 8 See drive time map 13

Analysis based on vehicle capacity LOS rating

^{*}Hours may be adjusted at some facilities to meet user demand

"NO" if one or more facilities in the alternative did not have an LOS score of at least a C – see vehicle capacity detail for information about each facility

"NO" if one or more facilities in the alternative did not have an LOS score of at least a C – see vehicle capacity detail for information about each facility

⁷ This criterion has been adapted to indicate future flexibility to expand service, e.g., HHW, or to support waste conversion technology Represents an assumed outcome; this criterion would need more thorough assessment